arXiv:1605.07765v1 [math.NT] 25 May 2016

ON SQUARE-FREE VALUES OF LARGE POLYNOMIALS OVER THE RATIONAL FUNCTION FIELD

DAN CARMON
WITH APPENDIX BY ALEXEI ENTIN

Abstract. We investigate the density of square-free values of polynomials with large coefficients over the rational function field $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$. Some interesting questions answered as special cases of our results include the density of square-free polynomials in short intervals, and an asymptotic for the number of representations of a large polynomial N as a sum of a small k-th power and a square-free polynomial.

1. Introduction - classical open problems

In this paper we establish function field analogues to certain classical open problems in analytic number theory, such as the representation of large integers by a sum of a square-free integer and a k-th power. We replace the large integers, by way of analogy, with polynomials of large degree over a fixed finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. Our new results will be presented in section 2.2. We shall first review the classical problems whose analogues we investigate, as well as currently known partial or conditional results about these questions.

1.1. **Square-free values of polynomials.** An integer n is called *square-free* if it is not divisible by the square of any integer $d > 1$. It is well known that the "probability" of a large "random" integer to be square-free is $\frac{1}{\zeta(2)}$ – more precisely, this is the density of the set of square-frees in the positive integers. A classical problem in number theory concerns the density of square-free values of polynomials:

Question 1. Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree k. Are there infinitely many positive integers n such that $f(n)$ is square-free? More ambitiously, compute the density of $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : f(n) \text{ square-free}\}$.

There are two obvious obstructions for such an f being square-free infinitely often. If f is divisible by the square of some non-constant polynomial $g \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, then clearly $f(a)$ can only be square-free when $g(a) = \pm 1$, which occurs for only finitely many a - this is a *global* obstruction. On the other hand, if for some prime p, $f(a)$ is divisible by p^2 for every a, then clearly

Date: May 26, 2016.
The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement n° 320755.

$f(a)$ is never square-free. These are the *local* obstructions, as they depend only on the behaviour of f modulo prime powers.

Define for any $d > 1$,

$$\rho(d) := \#\{a \bmod d : f(a) \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}.$$

For small primes p, the probability that $f(a)$ is not divisible by p^2 is approximately $1 - \frac{\rho(p^2)}{p^2}$. Heuristically, one expects these events to be nearly independent, hence the probability that $f(a)$ is indivisible by p^2 for all primes p should be $\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho(p^2)}{p^2}\right)$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of primes. Note that not being divisible by any p^2 is equivalent to being square-free. This leads to the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1. *Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a square-free polynomial of degree k. The set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : f(n)$ square-free$\}$ is conjectured to have density*

$$c_f := \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho(p^2)}{p^2}\right).$$

Note that if there is a local obstruction at a prime p, then $\rho(p^2) = p^2$ and the above product is 0. Otherwise, it is easily seen that $\rho(p^2) \leq k$ for p sufficiently large, hence the infinite product converges, and c_f is positive.

For $k = 1$, the conjecture is equivalent to the regular density of the square-frees. The conjecture has been proved for $k = 2$ by Ricci in the 1930's [10], and for $k = 3$ by Hooley in 1968 [5]. Unconditionally, the conjecture remains completely open for all $k \geq 4$. However, in [4], Granville proved the conjecture in full generality, assuming the ABC conjecture.

1.2. **A dual problem.** In the previous section we considered the density of square-free values of a fixed polynomial with fixed coefficients, as the argument grows larger and larger. What happens if we allow the polynomial to vary, with coefficients tending to infinity, possibly faster than the arguments? An example of this kind of question is the following:

Question 2. Does every sufficiently large $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ admit a representation as a sum $N = x^k + r$ of a positive k-th power and a positive square-free? How many such representations are there, asymptotically?

Clearly, finding such representations is equivalent to finding $x < N^{1/k}$ with $f(x) = N - x^k$ being square-free. Hence by the same heuristic arguments as before, we might expect the answer to be $c_f N^{1/k}$, where c_f is defined precisely the same – however, note that it now depends on N, as does f itself. As such, Question 2 does not follow immediately from Conjecture 1.1, although it might be resolved by similar techniques. Question 2 has been answered positively for $k = 2$ by Estermann in [2]. The case $k = 3$ was stated by Hooley [6, §4.6, Theorem 4][1]. Question 2 appears more

[1] In the form that any sufficiently large number is the sum of a cube and a square-free integer, with no claim on the asymptotic number of representations.

difficult and nuanced than Conjecture 1.1. Indeed, the proof outline Hooley presents for $k = 3$ uses strictly more ideas and methods than his proof of the density of the square-free values of cubics – and still cannot obtain the number of representations, nor is it applicable when x^3 is replaced with a general cubic polynomial. It is thus unsurprising that the case $k \geq 4$ is still open.

1.3. **Square-frees in short intervals.** Another classical problem of interest regards the number of square-free integers in short intervals, i.e. sets of the form $I(X, H) = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : X \leq n < X + H\}$, where H is much smaller than X. Clearly, the expectation of the density of square-free integers in such sets, when we average over all X, should be the same as that over all integers, i.e. $\frac{1}{\zeta(2)}$. We are interested in understanding how small we may take H, as a function of the size of X, such that the density will be accurate (up to smaller order deviations) for all X, and not just on average or for almost all X. This gives rise to the following classical conjecture:

Conjecture 1.2. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed, let X be large, and let $H \gg X^{\epsilon}$. Then*

$$\#\{n \in I(X, H) : n \text{ is square-free}\} = (1 + o(1))\frac{H}{\zeta(2)}.$$

Again, this conjecture follows from the ABC conjecture by Granville's method – see the Appendix; Granville [4] showed that the ABC conjecture implies that for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ there exist square-free integers in $I(X, X^{\epsilon})$, for all X sufficiently large. Unconditionally, the best known result is due to Tolev [11], who proved the asymptotic for any $H = H(X)$ such that $\frac{H}{X^{1/5}\log(X)} \to \infty$, building on results of Filaseta and Trifonov [3].

More ambitiously, we may ask this question not only for square-free integers, but for square-free values of polynomials:

Question 3. Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a square-free polynomial with $c_f > 0$. How small may we take $H = H(X)$ such that the asymptotic

$$\#\{n \in I(X, H) : f(n) \text{ is square-free}\} \sim c_f H$$

will hold for all X?

2. Function field analogues

2.1. **Square-free values of polynomials in function fields.** One may ask similar questions about polynomials over function fields, rather than over the integers. Fix a prime power q, let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be the finite field with q elements, and let $A = \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ be the ring of polynomials over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Let $f \in A[x]$ be a square-free polynomial of degree k (in x). As before, one may ask for the density of the square-free values of f. As in the integers, one may heuristically assume that the contributions from different primes in A are independent, and conjecture a density based on that heuristic. It turns out that in this setting, one may actually prove that this density is correct:

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of primes in A (i.e. monic, irreducible polynomials). For any $D \in A$, let $\rho(D) := \#\{a \bmod D : f(a) \equiv 0 \pmod D\}$, $||D|| := \#\{a \bmod D\} = q^{\deg D}$, and $c_f := \prod_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2}\right)$. Then*

$$\#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t] : \deg_t(a) < m, f(a) \text{ square-free}\} = c_f q^m + o(q^m)$$

as m tends to ∞.

This theorem was first proved by Ramsay [9]; however, his proof was valid only for polynomials $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$, rather than $\mathbb{F}_q[t, x]$, i.e. only polynomials with constant coefficients. Poonen [8] proved the theorem for all $\mathbb{F}_q[t, x]$, and generalized it further to multivariate polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[t, x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. In his 2014 M.Sc. thesis, Lando [7] gave a quantitative version of Poonen's work, and applied it to the problems of square-free and power-free values at prime polynomials.

2.2. **New results.** Our main goal in this paper is to extend the above results to polynomials f with large coefficients, giving quantitative answers to questions analogous to those presented in section 1, after replacing the integers with the polynomial ring over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Our methods include carefully applying Poonen's and Lando's techniques, as well as replacing some naïve sieving arguments with the more sophisticated Brun sieve. Specifically, we show:

Theorem 2.2. *Let $q = p^e$ be a fixed prime power, let $k > 0$ be a fixed integer, and let m, n be positive integers with $m \gg \log_q n \log_q \log_q n$ and $m \to \infty$.*[2] *Let $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[t, x]$ be a square-free polynomial with $\deg_x f \le k$, $\deg_t f \le n$. Let c_f be defined as before. Then*

$$\#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t] : \deg a < m, f(a) \text{ square-free}\} = c_f q^m (1 + o(1)).$$

From which we may immediately derive an analogue of Question 2:

Corollary 2.3. *Let $q = p^e$ be a fixed prime power, let $k > 0$ be a fixed integer, and let $N \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ be of sufficiently large degree n. Additionally, suppose that either k is co-prime to p, or N is not a p-th power. Then N has $c_{N,k} q^{\lceil n/k \rceil}(1+o(1))$ representations as $N = x^k + r$, with $x, r \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ such that r is square-free and $\deg x < \frac{n}{k}$, where $c_{N,k} = \prod_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho_{N,k}(P^2)}{P^2}\right)$ and $\rho_{N,k}(D) = \#\{a \bmod D : a^k \equiv N \pmod D\}$.*

Indeed, this is exactly the number of square-free values of $f(x) = N - x^k$, which is square-free[3] and has $\deg_x f = k$, $\deg_t f = n$, where x ranges over

[2] Note that if n is bounded, Theorem 2.2 is equivalent to Poonen's theorem. We would therefore be interested mostly in the case $n \to \infty$, and $m \to \infty$ would follow from the bound $m \gg \log_q n \log_q \log_q n$. In the course of the proof, we provide an explicit upper bound on the constant.

[3] Note that if N is a p-th power and $p \mid k$, then $f(x)$ is a p-th power as well, hence not square-free. It is easy to see that in all other cases, f is square-free, by considering its derivatives by x and t, which are co-prime to f whenever they are non-zero.

polynomials of degree less than $m = \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$, which clearly satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 as $n \to \infty$.

If we were to apply Theorem 2.2 to a short interval setting, with an interval of length $H = q^m$ consisting of polynomial of size $X = q^n$, it would state that we have the correct asymptotic when $m \gg \log_q n \log_q \log_q n$, or equivalently, for $H \geq (\log_q X)^{C \log_q \log_q \log_q X}$ for a certain constant C and all sufficiently large X. This is already much weaker than the condition $H \gg X^\epsilon$, but in fact we can go even lower:

Theorem 2.4. *Let $q = p^e$ be a fixed prime power, and $g \in \mathbb{F}_q[t, x]$ a fixed square-free polynomial with $\deg_x g = k$. Let n, m be large positive integers with $m - p(\log_q n - \log_q \log_q n) \to \infty$, and let $N(t) \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ be of degree n. Consider the interval of size $H = q^m$ around N,*

$$I(N, m) = \{N + a : a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t], \deg a < m\}.$$

Then

$$\#\{a \in I(N, m) : g(a) \text{ square-free}\} = c_g q^m (1 + o(1)).$$

In terms of H and X, the relation $m - p(\log_q n - \log_q \log_q n) \to \infty$ translates to $H \geq C \left(\frac{\log_q X}{\log_q \log_q X} \right)^p$ for any constant $C > 0$ and all sufficiently large X, i.e. a polylogarithmic relation. It seems quite peculiar that the characteristic of the field should play such an important role in this relation. We remark further that one may find intervals with $H \gg \frac{\log_q X}{\log_q \log_q X}$ that contain no square-free polynomials at all, by a straight-forward application of the Chinese Remainder Theorem; so this result is nearly sharp.

The proofs of the two theorems are very similar – they both involve essentially the same computations, but the different settings lead to different error terms being dominant, hence different lower bounds on m. In fact the two contributions are mostly disjoint, which allows us to generalize the two results into one unified theorem:

Theorem 2.5. *Let $q = p^e$ be a fixed prime power, $k > 0$ a fixed integer, and m, n_1, n_2 be varying positive integers with both $m \gg \log_q n_1 \log_q \log_q n_1$ and $m - p(\log_q n_2 - \log_q \log_q n_2 + 2k \log_q \log_q n_1) \to \infty$. Let $g \in \mathbb{F}_q[t, x]$ be a square-free polynomial with $\deg_x g \leq k$, $\deg_t g \leq n_1$. Let $N(t) \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ be of degree n_2, and let $I(N, m)$ be the interval of size q^m around N. Then*

$$\#\{a \in I(N, m) : g(a) \text{ square-free}\} = c_g q^m (1 + o(1)).$$

3. Proof of main theorem

We will begin by working in the setting of Theorem 2.2, for simplicity, but most of the computations will be immediately applicable to the other theorems as well. For brevity, let us denote for any set of polynomials A and any degree d, $A^{<d} = \{a \in A : \deg a < d\}$, and similarly define $A^{\geq d}, A^{=d}$.

Let us write $N = \{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : f(a) \text{ square-free}\}$. The first step towards estimating $\#N$ is to bound it from below and above by terms more closely related to the contributions of certain primes. We define

$$N' = \{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : \forall P \in \mathcal{P}^{<m_0}, P^2 \nmid f(a)\} \tag{3.1}$$

$$N'' = \{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \cap \mathcal{P}^{<m_1}, P^2 \mid f(a)\} \tag{3.2}$$

$$N''' = \{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}, P^2 \mid f(a)\} \tag{3.3}$$

where m_0 and m_1 are appropriately chosen thresholds. Specifically, we take $m_1 = \lceil m/2 \rceil$, and m_0 will be chosen later.

Clearly $N \subseteq N' \subseteq N \cup N'' \cup N'''$, hence $\#N' - \#N'' - \#N''' \leq \#N \leq \#N'$. We would therefore like to show that $\#N' = c_f q^m (1 + o(1))$ and $\#N'', \#N''' = o(c_f q^m)$. Before we proceed to prove these estimates, we need to establish bounds for certain sums and products related to f.

3.1. **Bounds on the singular sum.** We define the *singular sum* of the polynomial f as $S = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2}$. We also denote the tail of this series by $S(m_0) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0}} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2}$. Our goal in this section is to prove the following bounds on $S, S(m_0)$ and c_f:

Lemma 3.1. *Let q be a fixed prime power, $k > 0$ a fixed integer, and n, m_0 varying integers with $n \to \infty$. Let $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[t, x]$ be a square-free polynomial with $\deg_x f \leq k$ and $\deg_t f \leq n$. Define $\rho(D), S, S(m_0), c_f$ as above. We have the following asymptotic inequalities:*

$$S \leq k \ln \log_q n + O(1) = O(\ln \ln n), \tag{3.4}$$

$$S(m_0) = O\left(\frac{n}{m_0 q^{m_0}}\right), \tag{3.5}$$

$$c_f \gg (\log_q n)^{-2k}. \tag{3.6}$$

Write $f(t, x) = f_i(t, x) f_s(t, x)$ where $f_i(t, x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[t, x^p]$ is the product of all irreducible factors of $f(t, x)$ which are inseparable in x, and $f_s(t, x)$ has no x-inseparable factors. From the fact that $f(t, x)$ is square-free, we immediately see that f_i, f_s are co-prime and square-free, and furthermore f_i is co-prime to $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial t}$ and f_s is co-prime to $\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial x}$: Indeed, if $P(t, x)$ is an irreducible common divisor of f_s and $\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial x}$, it is easy to see that either $P^2 \mid f_s$, which contradicts f_s being square-free, or else $P \mid \frac{\partial P}{\partial x}$, which then implies that P is inseparable in x – contradicting the fact that f_s has no inseparable factors. Similarly, if $P(t, x)$ is an irreducible common divisor of $f_i, \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial t}$, then again either $P^2 \mid f_i$, which leads to contradiction, or P is inseparable in t. Since both $f_i, \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial t}$ are in $\mathbb{F}_q[t, x^p]$, either P^p must also be a common divisor, contradicting square-freedom, or P is also in $\mathbb{F}_q[t, x^p]$. But since it is also inseparable in t, it follows that $P \in \mathbb{F}_q[t^p, x^p]$, which means that P is a p-th power, contradicting its irreducibility.

Now, define $R(t) = \operatorname{Res}_x(f_i, \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}) \operatorname{Res}_x(f_s, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}) \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$. Note that $R(t)$ is non-zero: Indeed, by the above claims, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = f_s \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial t} + f_i \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t}$ is co-prime to f_i, and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = f_i \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial x} + f_s \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x}$ is co-prime to f_s. Note that the x- and t-degrees of the polynomials f_i, f_s and their derivatives are all at most k and n, respectively. Therefore, both resultants can be given as polynomials of degree at most $2k$ in the $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$-coefficients of their arguments, each of which is of degree at most n. Therefore $\deg R \leq 4kn = O(n)$. In particular R has at most $\frac{4kn}{m_0}$ prime factors of degree at least m_0.

For any prime $P \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $P \nmid R$, the residue $f \bmod P \in (\mathbb{F}_q[t]/(P))[x]$ is non-trivial (as every prime dividing the content of f also divides R). The residue also has degree $\leq k$, which then implies $\rho(P) \leq k$. Let $a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ represent a residue class in $\rho(P)$, i.e. satisfy $f(a) \equiv 0 \pmod P$. If furthermore $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(a) \not\equiv 0 \pmod P$, then by Hensel's lemma there is a unique lifting of a to a residue $\tilde{a} \bmod P^2$ satisfying $\tilde{a} \equiv a \pmod P, f(\tilde{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{P^2}$.

If, on the other hand, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(a) \equiv 0 \pmod P$, then P does not divide $f_s(a)$: Otherwise, a is a common root of f_s and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$ modulo P, which then implies $P \mid \operatorname{Res}_x(f_s, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x})$, contradicting $P \nmid R$. From $P \mid f(a) = f_s(a) f_i(a)$ it then follows that $P \mid f_i(a)$, and by the same argument as above, we must then have $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(a) \not\equiv 0 \pmod P$, and thus

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d} f(t, a(t))}{\mathrm{d}t} = \tfrac{\partial f}{\partial t}(a) + \tfrac{\partial f}{\partial x}(a) \tfrac{\mathrm{d}a}{\mathrm{d}t} \equiv \tfrac{\partial f}{\partial t}(a) \not\equiv 0 \pmod P.$$

In particular, it follows that $P(t)^2 \nmid f(t, a(t))$, for any such a. Therefore no residue $\tilde{a} \bmod P^2$ with $\tilde{a} \equiv a \pmod P$ satisfies $f(\tilde{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{P^2}$.

We have shown that for every residue $a \bmod P \in \rho(P)$, there is at most one lifting modulo P^2 which is in $\rho(P^2)$, assuming $P \nmid R$. Therefore for such primes, $\rho(P^2) \leq \rho(P) \leq k$.

The contribution of these primes to S is thus at most

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P} : P \nmid R} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} &\leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{k}{||P||^2} = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{=d}} \frac{k}{q^{2d}} \\ &\leq \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{q^{2d}} \frac{q^d}{d} = k \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{dq^d} \leq \frac{k}{q-1} = O(1),\end{aligned}$$

and similarly their contribution to the tail $S(m_0)$ is at most

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} : P \nmid R} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} \leq k \sum_{d=m_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{dq^d} = O\left(\frac{1}{m_0 q^{m_0}}\right).$$

On the other hand, for any prime $P \mid R$, we have $\rho(P^2) \leq k||P||$. Indeed, if P divides the content of f, then $\frac{f}{P} \in (\mathbb{F}_q[t]/(P))[x]$ is non-trivial, as f is square-free and in particular $P^2 \nmid f$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(P^2) &= \#\{a \bmod P^2 : f(a) \equiv 0 \pmod{P^2}\} \\ &= \#\{a \bmod P^2 : \tfrac{f(a)}{P} \equiv 0 \pmod P\}\end{aligned}$$

$$= \#\{a \bmod P : \tfrac{f(a)}{P} \equiv 0 \pmod{P}\} \cdot ||P|| \leq k||P||,$$

while for primes $P \mid R$ that do not divide the content, we simply have $\rho(P) \leq k$ and therefore $\rho(P^2) \leq ||P||\rho(P) \leq k||P||$.[4]

Therefore the contribution of the primes $P \mid R$ to the sum $S(m_0)$ is at most

$$\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \\ P|R}} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} \leq \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \\ P|R}} \frac{k||P||}{||P||^2} = \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \\ P|R}} \frac{k}{||P||}$$
$$\leq \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \\ P|R}} \frac{k}{q^{m_0}} \leq \frac{4kn}{m_0}\frac{k}{q^{m_0}} = O\left(\frac{n}{m_0 q^{m_0}}\right).$$

In order to obtain a bound on their contribution to S, denote for all $d > 0$, $u_d = \#\{P \in \mathcal{P}^{=d} : P \mid R\}$, and let $x_d = du_d$. The contribution to S is

$$\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P} \\ P|R}} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} \leq \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P} \\ P|R}} \frac{k}{||P||} = k\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{u_d}{q^d} = k\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_d}{dq^d}.$$

Note that for all $d > 0$, $du_d \leq d\pi_q(d) \leq q^d$, and $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} du_d \leq \deg R \leq 4kn$. As the sequence $\frac{1}{dq^d}$ is decreasing, it follows that the maximum of $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_d}{dq^d}$ under the constraints $0 \leq x_d \leq q^d$, $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} x_d \leq 4kn$ is attained when $x_d = q^d$ for all $d < n_0$, $x_{n_0} = 4kn - \sum_{d=1}^{n_0-1} x_d$, and $x_d = 0$ for all $d > n_0$. Note that n_0 is then determined uniquely by $0 \leq x_{n_0} \leq q^{n_0}$. Such values would not necessarily correspond to any actual R, but will serve for obtaining an upper bound. It follows that $q^{n_0-1} \leq 4kn$, hence $n_0 \leq \log_q(4kqn) = \log_q(n) + O(1)$. Thus

$$\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P} \\ P|R}} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} \leq k\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_d}{dq^d} \leq k\sum_{d=1}^{n_0} \frac{1}{d} = k(\ln(n_0) + O(1))$$
$$= O(\ln \ln n).$$

It is quite clear that for both $S, S(m_0)$, the bounds for the contributions of $P \mid R$ dominate those of $P \nmid R$, and yield the bounds (3.4),(3.5).

We now derive the lower bound $c_f \gg (\log_q n)^{-k-o(1)}$ using the upper bound on S. Let $\epsilon > 0$, and split the summands of S into those greater and lesser than ϵ. As each term is at most $\frac{k}{||P||}$, it follows that only boundedly many are greater than ϵ, and they of bounded degree, thus the contribution of these terms to the product $c_f = \prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2}\right)$ would be bounded

[4] A sharper argument shows that for primes $P \mid R$ that do not divide the content, we in fact have $\rho(P^2) \leq \frac{k}{2}||P||$, as any root of f modulo P that lifts to $||P||$ roots modulo P^2 must be a double root modulo P, and there can be only $k/2$ distinct double roots modulo P. This allows us to slightly improve the lower bound on c_f for content-free polynomials, but not in general.

below by some positive constant $C_\epsilon = C_{k,q,\epsilon} > 0$ independent of n (assuming no local obstructions exist, so that $1 - \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} \geq \frac{1}{||P||^2}$ for all P). On the other hand, for summands such that $x = \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} < \epsilon$, we have the inequality $\ln(1-x) > -\frac{x}{1-\epsilon}$, and hence the contributions of such terms to the product c_f is bounded below by $\exp\left(-\frac{S}{1-\epsilon}\right) \gg_{k,q} (\log_q n)^{-k/(1-\epsilon)}$. Taking the two terms together then yields $c_f \gg_{k,q} C_\epsilon (\log_q n)^{-k+O(\epsilon)}$. As C_ϵ is independent of n, letting $\epsilon \to 0$ sufficiently slowly as $n \to \infty$ would allow us to replace the bound by the aforementioned $c_f \gg (\log_q n)^{-k-o(1)}$. However, the exact exponent will have negligible relevance to our computations, and the bound (3.6) obtained by choosing $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ suffices for most purposes.

3.2. **Bounding N'': Medium primes.** The bound on the medium primes is the easiest of the three, and follows immediately from a simple union bound. Indeed, m_1 is chosen such that for any prime $P \in \mathcal{P}^{<m_1}$ we have $\deg(P^2) < m$ and thus $\#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : P^2 \mid f(a)\} = \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} q^m$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\#N'' &= \#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \cap \mathcal{P}^{<m_1}, P^2 \mid f(a)\} \\
&= \#\bigcup\nolimits_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \cap \mathcal{P}^{<m_1}} \{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : P^2 \mid f(a)\} \\
&\leq \sum\nolimits_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \cap \mathcal{P}^{<m_1}} \#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : P^2 \mid f(a)\} \\
&= \sum\nolimits_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0} \cap \mathcal{P}^{<m_1}} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} q^m \\
&\leq q^m \sum\nolimits_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_0}} \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} = q^m S(m_0).
\end{aligned}$$

It now suffices to choose m_0 large enough so that $S(m_0) = o(c_f)$. By (3.5), (3.6), we see that we may take any m_0 such that $\frac{m_0 q^{m_0}}{n(\log_q n)^{2k}} \to \infty$, which is clearly satisfied when e.g. $m_0 - \log_q n - 2k \log_q \log_q n \to \infty$. For simplicity, we shall write this condition as $m_0 \gg \log_q n$: For $n \to \infty$, the implied constant may be any constant greater than 1, and if n is bounded we only require $m_0 \to \infty$.

3.3. **Bounding N': Small primes.** We write $\mathcal{P}(m_0) = \prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{<m_0}} P$. A standard sieve theory argument gives

$$\#N' = \sum_{D \mid \mathcal{P}(m_0)} \mu(D) \#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : D^2 \mid f(a)\}.$$

For any square-free polynomial $D \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$, let $\nu(D)$ be the number of its prime factors. For a non-negative integer k, define

$$n_k = \sum_{\substack{D \mid P(m_0) \\ \nu(D) = k}} \#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : D^2 \mid f(a)\}$$

so that $\#N' = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(-1)^k n_k$. Brun's sieve is essentially the observation that the partial sums $N_r = \sum_{k=0}^{r}(-1)^k n_k$ alternate around the limit $\#N'$, i.e. $\#N' \le N_r$ for all even r, and $\#N' \ge N_r$ for all odd r [1, Chapter 6]. It will therefore suffice to prove that $N_r = c_f q^m(1+o(1))$ for sufficiently large r, which will then result in both upper and lower bounds on $\#N'$.

Suppose m_0, r satisfy $2m_0 r \le m$. It follows that for any $D \mid P(m_0)$ with $\nu(D) \le r$ we have $\deg(D^2) < 2m_0 r \le m$. Such D then satisfies

$$\#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : D^2 \mid f(a)\} = \rho(D^2) q^{m-2\deg D}.$$

Therefore for all $k \le r$, we have $n_k = \sum_{D|P(m_0),\nu(D)=k} \rho(D^2) q^{m-2\deg D}$, hence

$$N_r = q^m \sum_{\substack{D|P(m_0)\\ \nu(D)\le r}} \mu(D)\frac{\rho(D^2)}{||D||^2} =: q^m U(r, m_0).$$

We now wish to estimate $U(r, m_0)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} U(\infty, m_0) &= \sum_{D|P(m_0)} \mu(D)\frac{\rho(D^2)}{||D||^2} = \prod_{P\in\mathcal{P}^{<m_0}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2}\right) \\ &= c_f \prod_{P\in\mathcal{P}^{\ge m_0}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2}\right)^{-1} = c_f(1 + O(S(m_0)) = c_f(1+o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we assume m_0 is chosen such that $S(m_0) = o(c_f)$, as was already required for bounding $\#N''$, so in particular $S(m_0) = o(1)$.

It will thus suffice to bound $U(\infty, m_0) - U(r, m_0)$. Let us denote for any non-negative integer k, $v_k = \sum_{D|P(m_0),\nu(D)=k} \frac{\rho(D^2)}{||D||^2}$. Note that v_k is the k-th elementary symmetric polynomial of the finite multiset $\left\{\frac{\rho(P^2)}{||P||^2} : P \in \mathcal{P}^{<m_0}\right\}$, whose elements are positive real numbers. It follows that $v_k \le \frac{v_1^k}{k!}$. Furthermore v_1 is a partial sum of the singular sum S, hence $v_1 \le \lambda = k \ln\log_q n + O(1)$ by (3.4). Suppose $r = \alpha\lambda$ for some $\alpha > 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |U(\infty, m_0) - U(r, m_0)| &= \left|\sum_{k=r+1}^{\infty} (-1)^k v_k\right| \le \sum_{k=r+1}^{\infty} v_k \le \sum_{k=r+1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \\ &< \sum_{k=r+1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^r}{r!}\alpha^{r-k} < \frac{\lambda^r}{r!} < \frac{\lambda^r}{(r/e)^r} = \left(\frac{e\lambda}{r}\right)^r = \left(\frac{e}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha\lambda} \\ &= O\left((\log_q n)^{-\alpha\ln(\alpha/e)k}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now if $\alpha\ln(\alpha/e)$ is sufficiently large[5], then by (3.6),

$$|U(\infty, m_0) - U(r, m_0)| \ll (\log_q n)^{-k\alpha\ln(\alpha/e)} = o(c_f).$$

[5]In the case $n \to \infty$ it suffices to choose $\alpha\ln(\alpha/e) > 2$, which holds for $\alpha > 4.32$. If n is bounded, take $\alpha \to \infty$.

We have thus shown that for sufficiently large r satisfying $r \gg \log_q \log_q n$ and $r \to \infty$, $N_r = q^m c_f(1 + o(1))$, hence also $\#N' = c_f q^m(1 + o(1))$, as claimed.

For the proofs of the bounds on N', N'' to be valid simultaneously, we must be able to choose m_0, r with $m_0 \gg \log_q n$, $r \gg \log_q \log_q n$, $m_0, r \to \infty$ and $2m_0 r \leq m$. This is of course possible if and only if $m \gg \log_q n \log_q \log_q n$ and $m \to \infty$, hence our condition on m in Theorem 2.2. Careful examination of the required lower bounds on r, m_0 would allow the constant in the constraint $m \gg \log_q \log_q \log_q n$ to be as small as $9k \ln q$ for sufficiently large n.

3.4. **Bounding N''': Large primes.** The large primes require the most sophistication to estimate, though they contribute the smallest error. To do so, we apply Poonen's technique of replacing our target polynomial by an equivalent multivariate polynomial with a simpler t-derivative, and carefully retrace Lando's bounds on the corresponding contributions to N''', noting the size of our coefficients.

Given the polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[t][x]$, we define a new polynomial F by $F(y_0, \ldots, y_{p-1}) = f(y_0^p + t y_1^p + \cdots + t^{p-1} y_{p-1}^p) \in \mathbb{F}_q[t][y_0^p, y_1^p, \ldots, y_{p-1}^p]$. Note that $\deg_x(f) \leq k, \deg_t(f) \leq n$ together imply a bound on F's coefficients and degrees: $\deg_t(F) < n + pk = O(n)$, $\deg_{y_i}(F) \leq pk$.

Poonen's lemmas show that f being square-free implies F is, also [8, Lemma 7.2]; which in turn implies that F and $G = \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}$ are coprime [8, Lemma 7.3][6]. On the other hand, for any $y \in (\mathbb{F}_q[t])^p$, $P^2 \mid F(y)$ if and only if $P \mid F(y)$ and $P \mid G(y)$. This is due to the fact that, as the y_i-s appear in F only with exponents divisible by p, $G(y) = \frac{\mathrm{d}(F(y))}{\mathrm{d}t}$ for all y. Finally observe that $\deg_t G \leq \deg_t F = O(n)$, $\deg_{y_i}(G) \leq \deg_{y_i}(F) \leq pk$.

Let $m_p = \lceil \frac{m}{p} \rceil \leq \lceil \frac{m}{2} \rceil = m_1$, and for any positive integer l, let $B_l = (\mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m_p})^{l+1}$. Note that when we let the p-tuple y range over all B_{p-1}, $a = y_0^p + t y_1^p + \cdots + t^{p-1} y_{p-1}^p$ ranges over all $\mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<pm_p}$, which contains $\mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m}$. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\#N''' &= \#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m} : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}, P^2 \mid f(a)\} \\
&\leq \#\{y \in B_p : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}, P^2 \mid f(y_0^p + t y_1^p + \cdots + t^{p-1} y_{p-1}^p)\} \\
&= \#\{y \in B_p : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}, P^2 \mid F(y)\} \\
&= \#\{y \in B_p : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}, P \mid F(y) \text{ and } P \mid G(y)\} \\
&= O_{p,pk}\left(\frac{n + m_1}{m_1} q^{(p-1)m_p}\right) = O_{p,k}\left(\frac{n+m}{m q^{\frac{m}{p} - p}} q^m\right), \qquad (3.7)
\end{aligned}
$$

[6] Poonen in fact shows only that they are coprime in $\mathbb{F}_q(t)[y_0, \ldots, y_{p-1}]$, whereas we need them to be coprime in $\mathbb{F}_q[t][y_0, \ldots, y_{p-1}]$. This is easy to verify – it is enough to check that they have no common factor $P \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$. Such a factor will necessarily divide the contents of both $F(y_0, 0, \ldots, 0) = f(y_0^p)$ and $G(y_0, 0, \ldots, 0) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(y_0^p)$. This in turn implies that P^2 divides f, contradicting our assumption that it is square-free.

where the bound in the final line follows from the following proposition, analogous to [7, Proposition 5]:

Proposition 3.2. *Let k, l, n, m_p, m_1 be positive integers with $m_1 \geq m_p$, let $f, g \in \mathbb{F}_q[t][y_0, \ldots, y_l]$ be coprime polynomials in $l+1$ variables with $\deg_{y_i}(f), \deg_{y_i}(g) \leq k$ and $\deg_t(f), \deg_t(g) \leq n$, and B_l as above. Define*

$$\mathcal{N}_l(f,g) = \#\{y \in B_l : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}, P \mid f(y) \text{ and } P \mid g(y)\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{N}_l(f,g) = O_{l,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{l m_p}\right)$.

Thus, from (3.7) and (3.6), it follows that $\#N''' = o(c_f q^m)$ when e.g. $m - p(\log_q n + 2k \log_q \log_q n) \to \infty$, which is certainly the case under the assumptions of Theorem 2.2.

Before we prove proposition 3.2, we first need a simpler bound, slightly generalizing [7, Proposition 6] and giving exact bounds.

Proposition 3.3. *Let k, l, n, m_p, f, B_l be as in Proposition 3.2, and suppose f is not identically 0. Then*

$$\#\{y \in B_l : f(y) = 0\} \leq k(l+1) q^{l m_p}.$$

Proof. If $l = 0$, then $f(y_0)$ is a non-vanishing polynomial of degree at most k in y_0. Hence it has at most k roots in all of $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$, and in particular $\#\{y \in B_0 : f(y) = 0\} \leq k$, as claimed.

We proceed by induction on l. Consider f as a polynomial in y_l, of degree at most k, with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_q[t][y_0, \ldots, y_{l-1}]$. We write it as $f(y', y_l)$, where $y' = (y_0, \ldots, y_{l-1})$. Let $f_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q[t][y_0, \ldots, y_{l-1}]$ be its leading coefficient. Clearly, f_0 also satisfies the degree requirements of Proposition 3.3, hence by induction,

$$\#\{y' \in B_{l-1} : f_0(y') = 0\} \leq k l q^{(l-1)m_p}. \tag{3.8}$$

On the other hand, for any $y' \in B_{l-1}$ with $f_0(y) \neq 0$, there are at most $\deg_{y_l}(f) \leq k$ values of y_l in all $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$ for which $f(y', y_l) = 0$. Thus

$$\#\{(y', y_l) \in B_l : f_0(y') \neq 0, f(y', y_l) = 0\} \leq k \# B_{l-1} = k q^{l m_p}. \tag{3.9}$$

Using both (3.8), (3.9), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\#\{(y', y_l) \in B_l : f(y', y_l) = 0\} \\
&\leq \#\{(y', y_l) \in B_l : f_0(y') = 0\} + \#\{(y', y_l) \in B_l : f_0(y') \neq 0, f(y', y_l) = 0\} \\
&= q^{m_p} \#\{y' \in B_{l-1} : f_0(y') = 0\} + \#\{(y', y_l) \in B_l : f_0(y') \neq 0, f(y', y_l) = 0\} \\
&\leq q^{m_p} k l q^{(l-1)m_p} + k q^{l m_p} = k(l+1) q^{l m_p}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Using exactly the same arguments, one may also show the following similar proposition:

Proposition 3.4. *Let $k, l, n, m_p, m_1, f, B_l$ be as in Proposition 3.2, let $P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}$ be a large prime and suppose f is not identically 0 modulo P. Then*

$$\mathcal{N}_l(f, P) = \#\{y \in B_l : P \mid f(y)\} \leq k(l+1)q^{lm_p}.$$

Note that we rely strongly on $m_1 \geq m_p$, which implies that each residue class modulo P has at most a single representative in $\mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m_p}$. We omit the rest of the proof, which is just a repetition of the proof of Proposition 3.3.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Again, we induce on l. To avoid repetition, our induction base will be $l = -1$, where $f, g \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$, and $B_{-1} = \{()\}$ is a singleton containing only the empty tuple. The claim then immediately follows from f, g being coprime in $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$, i.e. $\nexists P \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $P \mid f$ and $P \mid g$, and in particular $\{y \in B_{-1} : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}, P \mid f(y) \text{ and } P \mid g(y)\}$ is empty. Hence $\mathcal{N}_l(f, g) = 0 = O_k(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{-m_p})$.

We denote $A_l = \mathbb{F}_q[t, y_0, \ldots, y_{l-1}]$. Consider $f, g \in A_l[y_l]$ as single variable polynomials in y_l with coefficients in the polynomial ring A_l, and let $f_C, g_C \in A_l$ be their respective contents. We may then write $f = f_C f_I, g = g_C g_I$ where $f_I, g_I \in A_l[y_l]$ are indivisible by any non-scalar polynomial in A_l. Clearly f_C, f_I are coprime to g_C, g_I, and all four polynomials have y_i-degrees at most k and t-degrees at most n. We also have

$$\mathcal{N}_l(f, g) \leq \mathcal{N}_l(f_I, g_I) + \mathcal{N}_l(f_I, g_C) + \mathcal{N}_l(g_I, f_C) + \mathcal{N}_l(f_C, g_C).$$

Therefore it is enough to show that each of the four summands on the right hand side is bounded by $O_{l,k}(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p})$.

Note that, as both f_C and g_C are independent of y_l, and by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_l(f_C, g_C) = q^{m_p} \mathcal{N}_{l-1}(f_C, g_C) &= q^{m_p} O_{l-1,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{(l-1)m_p}\right) \\ &= O_{l,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p}\right).\end{aligned}$$

For both $\mathcal{N}_l(f_C, g_I)$, $\mathcal{N}_l(f_I, g_C)$, we have one polynomial in A_l and the second indivisible by any polynomial in A_l. We wish to bound $\mathcal{N}_l(f_I, g_I)$ by a term of this form as well. To do so, let $R = \mathrm{Res}_{y_l}(f_I, g_I) \in A_l$ be the resultant of f_I, g_I. By basic properties of the resultant, for any choice of $y_i \in \mathbb{F}_q[t], P \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $P \mid f_I(y), P \mid g_I(y) \implies P \mid R(y)$. Thus $\mathcal{N}_l(f_I, g_I) \leq \mathcal{N}_l(f_I, R)$. Further note that from $\deg_{y_l}(f_I), \deg_{y_l}(g_I) \leq k$ it follows that R is given as a polynomial of degree $\leq 2k$ in the A_l coefficients of f_I, g_I, Hence in particular $\deg_t(R) \leq 2kn$, $\deg_{y_i}(R) \leq 2k^2$. Also note that R is non-zero, as f_I, g_I are co-prime.

We now claim that for any polynomials $R \in A_l, f \in A_l[y_l]$ such that f is indivisible by non-scalar polynomials in A_l, and with $\deg_t f \leq n, \deg_{y_i} f \leq k$ and $\deg_t R \leq 2kn, \deg_{y_i} R \leq 2k^2$, we have $\mathcal{N}_l(f, R) = O_{l,k}(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p})$. This

bound would then be applicable to $\mathcal{N}_l(f_I, g_C)$, $\mathcal{N}_l(g_I, f_C)$ and $\mathcal{N}_l(f_I, g_I)$, finishing our induction step.

Let $R = \prod_{j\in J} R_j$ be R's decomposition into irreducible polynomials. We have $\mathcal{N}_l(f,R) \le \sum_{j\in J} \mathcal{N}_l(f, R_j)$. Note that for each j, $R_j \in A_l$, therefore $R_j \nmid f$ and f, R_j are coprime. Let us partition $J = J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_3$, where $J_1 = \{j \in J : R_j \notin \mathbb{F}_q[t]\}$, $J_2 = \{j \in J : R_j \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{\ge m_1}\}$, and $J_3 = \{j \in J : R_j \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]^{<m_1}\}$. As $\deg_t R \le 2kn$ and the total degree of R in all y-variables is at most $2k^2 l$, we have $\#J_2 \le \frac{2kn}{m_1}, \#J_1 \le 2k^2 l$.

For each $j \in J_3$, $y \in B_l$, we have $R_j(y) = R_j$, so clearly $\nexists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\ge m_1}$ with $P \mid R_j$, hence $\mathcal{N}_l(f, R_j) = 0$. Similarly, for each $j \in J_2$, the conditions of proposition 3.4 are satisfied for $f, P = R_j$. Hence $\mathcal{N}_l(f, R_j) \le k(l+1)q^{lm_p} = O_{l,k}(q^{lm_p})$.

Finally, for each $j \in J_1$, let $f_0 \in A_l$ be some coefficient of f (as a polynomial in y_l) such that $R_j \nmid f_0$ as polynomials. Such a coefficient must exist as $R_j \nmid f$. We now bound $\mathcal{N}_l(f, R_j)$, again by splitting into three trivially covering sets:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{N}_l(f,R_j) = \#\{y \in B_l : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\ge m_1}, P \mid f(y) \text{ and } P \mid R_j(y)\} \\
&\le \#\{y \in B_l : R_j(y) = 0\} \\
&+ \#\{y \in B_l : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\ge m_1}, P \mid f_0(y) \text{ and } P \mid R_j(y)\} \\
&+ \#\{y \in B_l : R_j(y) \ne 0, \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\ge m_1}, P \mid R_j(y), P \mid f(y) \text{ and } P \nmid f_0(y)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By proposition 3.3, the first summand is clearly $O_{l,k}(q^{lm_p})$. The second summand, by definition, is $\mathcal{N}_l(f_0, R_j)$. As R_j is irreducible, it follows that f_0, R_j are coprime. We also certainly have $\deg_{y_i}(f_0), \deg_{y_i}(R_j) \le 2k^2$ and $\deg_t(f_0), \deg_t(R_j) \le 2kn$. Therefore f_0, R_j satisfy the conditions of proposition 3.2, but with smaller l (albeit larger degrees). Hence by the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_l(f_0, R_j) = q^{m_p}\mathcal{N}_{l-1}(f_0, R_j) &= q^{m_p} O_{l-1,2k^2}\left(\frac{2kn+m_1}{m_1} q^{(l-1)m_p}\right) \\
&= O_{l,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p}\right). \qquad (3.10)
\end{aligned}$$

To bound the third term, note that for each $y = (y', y_l) \in B_{l-1} \times B_0 = B_l$ such that $R_j(y) = R_j(y') \ne 0$, we must have $\deg_t(R_j(y')) \le 2kn + 2k^2 l m_p$. If we let $\mathcal{P}_{y'} = \{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\ge m_1} : P \mid R_j(y'), P \nmid f_0(y')\}$, it follows that $\#\mathcal{P}_{y'} \le \frac{2kn+2k^2lm_p}{m_1} = O_{l,k}(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1})$. On the other hand, for each $y' \in B_{l-1}, P \in \mathcal{P}_{y'}$, $f(y', y_l)$ is a polynomial of degree $\le k$ in y_l, which is non-vanishing modulo P. Since $\deg_t(P) \ge m_1 \ge m_p$, it follows that $\#\{y_l \in B_0 : P \mid f(y', y_l)\} \le k$. Therefore

$$\#\{y \in B_l : R_j(y) \ne 0, \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\ge m_1}, P \mid R_j(y), P \mid f(y) \text{ and } P \nmid f_0(y)\}$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{y'\in B_{l-1}\\ R_j(y')\neq 0}} \#\{y_l \in B_0 : \exists P \in \mathcal{P}^{\geq m_1}, P \mid R_j(y'), P \mid f(y', y_l) \text{ and } P \nmid f_0(y')\}$$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{y'\in B_{l-1}\\ R_j(y')\neq 0}} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_{y'}} \#\{y_l \in B_0 : P \mid f(y', y_l)\} \leq \sum_{\substack{y'\in B_{l-1}\\ R_j(y')\neq 0}} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_{y'}} k$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{y'\in B_{l-1}\\ R_j(y')\neq 0}} O_{l,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1}\right) = O_{l,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p}\right).$$

Taking the three results together, we find $\mathcal{N}_l(f, R_j) = O_{l,k}(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p})$ for all $j \in J_1$. Now combining the different bounds for each J_i, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_l(f, g) &\leq \sum_{j\in J_1} \mathcal{N}(f, R_j) + \sum_{j\in J_2} \mathcal{N}(f, R_j) + \sum_{j\in J_3} \mathcal{N}(f, R_j) \\
&= \sum_{j\in J_1} O_{l,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p}\right) + \sum_{j\in J_2} O_{l,k}\left(q^{lm_p}\right) + \sum_{j\in J_3} 0 \\
&\leq 2k^2 l \cdot O_{l,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p}\right) + \frac{2kn}{m_1} \cdot O_{l,k}\left(q^{lm_p}\right) \\
&= O_{l,k}\left(\frac{n+m_1}{m_1} q^{lm_p}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

as we wanted to show.

□

4. Proof of Theorems 2.4, 2.5

4.1. **Proof of Theorem 2.4.** Define $f(x) = g(t, N(t) + x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[t][x]$. Clearly $\deg_x f = \deg_x g = k$, and $\deg_t f \leq \deg_x g \cdot \deg_t N + \deg_t g = kn + \deg_t g = O(n)$. Furthermore, as f is obtained from g simply by a fixed $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$ translation of the x variable, g being square-free implies that f is square-free, and more importantly, $\rho_f(D) = \rho_g(D) = \rho(D)$ for any polynomial D. Therefore they also have the same singular sum and series, i.e. $S_f(m_0) = S_g(m_0)$, as well as $S_f = S_g$ and $c_f = c_g$ being constants independent of the choice of $N(t)$ or its degree n. Thus taking any $m_0 \to \infty, r \to \infty$, we have immediately $S(m_0) = o(1) = o(c_f)$ and $\frac{r}{S} \to \infty$, from which we obtain $\#N' = c_f q^m(1 + o(1))$ and $\#N'' = o(c_f q^m)$ following the proofs in sections 3.3, 3.2. To be able to choose such r, m_0, we only need $m \to \infty$.

We are left only with the need to validate the bound on N''', and here finally n does come into play, as it still affects the relevant degrees. As c_f is now a constant, (3.7) implies that $\#N''' = o(1) = o(c_f)$ when $\frac{mq^{m/p}}{n} \to \infty$, which is equivalent to $m - p(\log_q n - \log_q \log_q n) \to \infty$, as we required in the theorem's statement. □

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.5.** Similarly to the above, we observe that when we move to $f(x) = g(N(t) + x)$, the expressions determined by the singular sum, $S, S(m_0)$ and c_f, will depend only on g and not on N. Thus the bounds (3.4)–(3.6) will all be valid with n replaced by n_1, as will the computations of sections 3.2, 3.3, as long as we may choose $r, m_0 \to \infty$ with $m_0 \gg \log_q n_1$, $r \gg \log_q \log_q n_1$ and $2m_0 r \leq m$, which is possible due to the assumption $m \gg \log_q n_1 \log_q \log_q n_1$.

For the bound on $\#N'''$, we observe that $\deg_t f \leq kn_2 + n_1$. If $n_2 \ll n_1$, then $\deg_t f \ll n_1$ and we are basically in the case of Theorem 2.2, where the contribution of N''' is negligible. Otherwise, n_2 is much greater than n_1, so $\deg_t f \ll n_2$. Thus (3.7) holds with the degree n replaced by n_2. Taken together with (3.6) with n replaced by n_1, we see that $\#N''' = o(c_f q^m)$ would follow from $\frac{mq^{m/p}}{n_2(\log_q n_1)^{2k}} \to \infty$, which is equivalent to $m - p(\log_q n_2 - \log_q \log_q n_2 + 2k \log_q \log_q n_1) \to \infty$, as we required. □

Remark. We can in fact make a slight improvement here on the required condition: By using $c_f \gg (\log_q n_1)^{-k-o(1)}$ instead of (3.6), the constant coefficient $2k$ can be replaced with any constant greater than k, or with some (specific) function of the type $k + o(1)$.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Zeév Rudnick for proposing the problems which motivated the majority of this paper, as well as many helpful suggestions and references. The author also thanks Alexei Entin, for contributing the appendix, and for suggesting the use of Brun's sieve, without which the results of this paper would have been far weaker.

APPENDIX: ON THE NUMBER OF SQUAREFREE INTEGERS IN SHORT INTERVALS

ALEXEI ENTIN

Abstract. Assuming the ABC conjecture we show that for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ the number of squarefree integers in the interval $[x, x+H)$ is $\sim \frac{6}{\pi^2}H$ provided $H > x^\epsilon$.

A.1. **Introduction.** We consider the problem of counting the number of squarefree integers in the interval $[x, x+H]$, where x and H are large positive real numbers. We are interested in the case that $H = x^\epsilon$ for some fixed $\epsilon > 0$ while $x \to \infty$. It is an open problem to show that for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ there exists even a single squarefree integer in the interval $[x, x+H]$ with $H = x^\epsilon$ for large enough x. The best known result in this direction is due to Filaseta and Trifonov [3] who showed the existence of squarefree integers in $[x, x+H]$ for $H \gg x^{1/5}\log x$. It was shown by Tolev [11] that when $\frac{H}{x^{1/5}\log x} \to \infty$, the number of squarefrees in the interval $[x, x+H]$ is in fact asymptotic to $(6/\pi^2)H$. It was shown by Granville [4] that assuming the ABC conjecture for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a squarefree integer in $[x, x+x^\epsilon]$ for x large enough. Our main result is the following:

Theorem A.1. *Assume the ABC conjecture. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed. Then the number of squarefree integers in the interval $[x, x+H)$ is $\sim \frac{6}{\pi^2}H$ provided $H > x^\epsilon$.*

We note that $6/\pi^2 = \zeta(2)^{-1}$, where $\zeta(s)$ is the Riemann zeta-function. By essentially the same argument it can be shown that assuming the ABC conjecture for any fixed k the number of k-power-free integers in $[x, x+H)$ is $\sim \zeta(k)^{-1}H$ provided $H > x^\epsilon$ for fixed $\epsilon > 0$.

A.2. **Proof of Theorem A.1.**

Proposition A.2. *The number of integers in the interval $[x, x+H)$ which are not divisible by any square of a prime $p < H$ is $\sim \frac{6}{\pi^2}H$ as $H \to \infty$.*

Proof. It is elementary to see that the number of integers in $[x, x+H)$ not divisible by p^2 for any $p < \frac{1}{2}\log H$ is $\sim \zeta(2)^{-1}H = \frac{6}{\pi^2}H$ (this is seen by exact sieving over all primes up to $\frac{1}{2}\log H$). The number of integers in $[x, x+H)$ divisible by p^2 for some $\frac{1}{2}\log H < p < H$ is bounded by

$$\sum_{\frac{1}{2}\log H < p < H} \left(\frac{H}{p^2} + 1\right) \ll \frac{H}{\log H} = o(H),$$

which is asymptotically negligible. □

We will need the following result due to Granville [4, Corollary 2.1]:

Proposition A.3. *Assume the ABC conjecture. Let $F(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a fixed squarefree polynomial and $\alpha > 0$ a fixed constant. Let y be a natural number and assume that $s^2|F(y)$ for some natural number s. Then for y large enough we have $s \leq y^{1+\alpha}$.*

Proposition A.4. *Assume the ABC conjecture. If $H < x$ and $H \to \infty$ then the number of integers in $[x, x+H)$ divisible by the square of any prime $p > x^\epsilon$ is $o(H)$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda > 0$ be a constant. Assume that the number of integers in $[x, x+H)$ divisible by p^2 for some prime $p > x^\epsilon$ is $> \lambda H$. We want to show that H must be bounded (for any fixed λ). Denote $N = \lceil 2/\epsilon \rceil, M = \lceil 2N/\lambda \rceil$ (these are both fixed constants for fixed ϵ, λ). The interval $[x, x+H)$ necessarily contains a subinterval $[y, y+M)$ with at least $\frac{1}{2}\lambda M \geq N$ (if M divides H the $\frac{1}{2}$ factor is unnecessary) elements divisible by some p^2 for some prime $p > x^\epsilon \gg y^\epsilon$.

Assuming by way of contradiction that H can be arbitrarily large, we see that there must exist arbitrarily large y s.t. at least N integers in the interval $[y, y+M)$ are divisible by a square of some prime $p \gg y^\epsilon$. By the pigeonhole principle there must exist some fixed distinct $a_1, ..., a_N \geq 0$ s.t. for infinitely many y each $y+a_1, ..., y+a_N$ is divisible by the square of some prime $p \gg y^\epsilon$.

Denote $F(X) = (X+a_1)...(X+a_N) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. This is a squarefree polynomial. From the above we see that for infinitely many y the value $F(y)$ is divisible by the square of some $d = p_1...p_N \gg y^{N\epsilon} \geq y^2$. But this contradicts Proposition A.3 (taking any $\alpha < 1$ in the proposition). □

Combining Proposition A.2 and Proposition A.4 we deduce Theorem 1.

References

[1] Cojocaru, A. C., and Murty, M. R. *An Introduction to Sieve Methods and their Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

[2] Estermann, T. Einige Sätze über quadratfreie Zahlen. *Mathematische Annalen 105* (1931), 653–662.

[3] Filaseta, M., and Trifonov, O. On gaps between squarefree numbers II. *J. London Math. Soc. s2-45*, 2 (1992), 215–221.

[4] Granville, A. ABC allows us to count squarefrees. *Int. Math. Res. Not. 19* (1998), 991–1009.

[5] Hooley, C. On the square-free values of cubic polynomials. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik 229* (1968), 147–154.

[6] Hooley, C. *Applications of Sieve Methods to the Theory of Numbers*, vol. 70 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 1976.

[7] Lando, G. Square-free values of polynomials evaluated at primes over a function field. *Q. J. Math. 66*, 3 (2015), 905–224.

[8] Poonen, B. Squarefree values of multivariable polynomials. *Duke Math. J 118* (2003), 353–373.

[9] Ramsay, K. Square-free values of polynomials in one variable over function fields. *Int. Math. Res. Not. 4* (1992), 97–102.

[10] Ricci, G. Ricerche aritmetiche sui polinomi. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo 57*, 1 (1933), 433–475.

[11] Tolev, D. I. On the distribution of r-tuples of squarefree numbers in short intervals. *Int. J. Number Theory 2* (2006), 225–234.

Raymond and Beverly Sackler School of Mathematical Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel